

**REMARKS****Claim Status**

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application, and claims 1-6 have been withdrawn from consideration. This paper amends claims 7, 9, 12, and 14. Claims 7 and 12 are the independent claims of the application under consideration. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

**Section 112 Rejections**

The Examiner rejected claims 7-16 under 35 USC 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner stated independent claim 7, lines 11-12, recite “translating said set of universal part numbers into a second set of proprietary part number; and generating a second document using the second set of proprietary numbers...” The Examiner notes that page 14, lines 16-22 of the application recite “the translation module looks to the true proprietary numbers and translates them back to the numbers that were originally provided by the user 135 in step 315...generates a BOM...” The Examiner states that the disclosure of “the true proprietary numbers...back to the numbers that were originally provided” does not provide written support for the new limitation of “translating said set of universal part numbers into a second set of proprietary part number.” The Examiner felt the same issue was present in independent claim 12.

Responsive to the Examiner's 112 rejection, Applicants have amended independent claims 7 and 12 to claim "translating said set of *true* universal part numbers into *numbers originally provided by the user*, and generating *shipping papers or electronic records* using the set of proprietary part numbers *originally provided by the user translated from the set of true universal part numbers* that summarizes a transaction involving the parts."

Claims 7 and 12 now comply with the written description given in the specification. Claims 8-11 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 7, and claims 13-16 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 12. For at least these reasons, claims 7-16 are patentable over the 35 USC 112 rejections.

### Section 103 Rejections

The Office Action rejected claims 7-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Hinckley (US Pub. 2002/0055886 A1). The Examiner rejected claims 7, 9, and 10, stating Hinckley discloses a method for translating a document that includes a set of proprietary part numbers over a network, including the steps of receiving a first document, including a first set of proprietary part numbers from a client workstation, wherein a user of said client workstation...translating said first set of proprietary part numbers into a set of proprietary part numbers into a set of universal part numbers, determining availability of one or more parts associated with said set of universal part numbers, translating said set of universal part numbers into a second set of proprietary part numbers, and generating a second document that summarizes a transaction involving the parts. However, the Examiner admits that Hinckley does not explicitly describe generating the second document using the second set of

proprietary part numbers. The Examiner stated that Hinckley describes an improvement that benefits component buyers by reducing procurement cycle time and improved access to competitive pricing and available inventories.

Responsive to these rejections, Applicants have amended independent claims 7 and 12 to claim “translating said set of *true* universal part numbers into *numbers originally provided by the user*, and generating *shipping papers or electronic records* using the set of proprietary part numbers *originally provided by the user translated from the set of true universal part numbers* that summarizes a transaction involving the parts.” Hinckley does not teach these features of independent claims 7 and 12, particularly with respect to generating shipping papers or electronic records using the set of proprietary part numbers originally provided by the user translated from the set of true universal part numbers that summarizes a transaction involving the parts. Applicants describe, in part, that “software at the one or more dedicated servers determines the relative availability of the part requested by user. This may involve looking to parts from other companies or parts that are identified by other numbers than those specified by the user... This is done by translating the proprietary part number provided by the user into a universal number and checking what parts are associated with that universal number. In this step, the order is filled using such parts as are available, or from suppliers or manufacturers that the user has a stated preference for... a record of the true part numbers and the amounts of the parts ordered or backordered is stored in the first database. Any other such alterations to database that are required (such as adjusting the general availability of parts) are made at this time...the translation module looks to the true proprietary numbers and translates them back to the numbers that were originally provided by the user...The

translation module generates a BOM or other such shipping papers or electronic records and transmits the record back to the user. In this way the user has a record of the transaction that is readily comprehensible to him. Additional and further information may also be included in this record; such as the manufacturers or suppliers who provided the parts and other billing information.” (See application, page 14, lines 4-22).

Since claims 8-11 and 13-16 depend from independent claims 7 and 12 either directly or indirectly, and claims 7 and 12 are now believed to be patentable, claims 8-11 and 13-16 are also patentable over Hinckley. Applicants respectfully submit that the application is patentable over the §103 rejection and request allowance of these claims.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are patentable over Hinckley. To discuss any matter pertaining to the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (650) 947-0700. Having made an effort to bring the application in condition for allowance, a timely notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 16, 2007



Dane C. Butzer  
Reg. No. 43,521

The Swernofsky Law Group  
P.O. Box 390013  
Mountain View, CA 94039-0013  
(650) 947-0700